UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

European Notes—IV

(*Conclusion*)

By John Haynes Holmes

Religion in Education - - *James H. Cousins*

The Fascination of the Sea - *J. T. Sunderland*

I Shot at God (*Poem*) - - *William H. Roberts*

Whither North America - - *Frank Doane*

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 12

Chicago, August 19, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 235
European Notes IV (Concluded)—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 238

ARTICLES—
Thank God for the Jew—SYDNEY STRONG 235
Religion in Education—JAMES H. COUSINS 242
The Fascination of the Sea—J. T. SUNDERLAND 243
Whither North America—FRANK DOANE 247

POETRY—
O World!—ROBERT WHITAKER 241
Blazers of Brotherhood—LUCIA TRENT 241
I Shot at God—WILLIAM H. ROBERTS 246
Aspiration—CLAIRE STEWART BOYER 250

THE STUDY TABLE—
Clubfoot—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 248
"Jesus Was Not Jew"—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 249

THE FIELD—
The Labor Sunday Message—*Federal Council of Churches* 234
An Attack on Freedom—*The Churchman* 251
Books Received 252

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Labor Sunday Message*

For over five years the people of this land have suffered untold hardship. Millions have vainly sought work. Some 20,000,000 men, women and children have been thrown upon public relief. Other millions have lived in constant fear of the same fate. In city, town and county, many American families have been reduced to living standards unprecedented in our history. All this has produced strife and bitterness. Both in our great cities and in rural areas labor unrest, strikes and lockouts have grown in number and severity. In many areas troops have been called out. Armed bands have sought to intimidate those who would protest against their conditions of labor. Scores have been killed and hundreds have been injured in these conflicts. But this crisis is not confined to our own land. In nearly all countries the outlook is similar. Governments have seemed powerless to solve the problems created by modern civilization. And over all there hangs the constant threat of war fought with the devastating weapons created by science.

The churches of America have not been and cannot be indifferent to this situation. They cannot pass by on the other side and say it is not their concern. The Founder of their faith declared that he came that men might have life and have it abundantly. The conditions under which men live and secure their food, clothing and shelter in no small measure affect their spiritual as well as their physical well-being. Men may justly ask today for some word of hope and counsel in this fearful time. Especially may those who toil look to the disciples of the Carpenter of Nazareth who said: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden." The organized opposition to the Christian Church today is in no small measure due to its failure adequately to meet a justified expectation.

But in the midst of our suffering

*Issued by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, through its Department of the Church and Social Service.

(*Continued on Page 251*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1935 No. 12

THANK GOD FOR THE JEW

I thank God for the Jew!

I never saw a Jew until I was old enough to go to college, so have no inherited bias. Since then I have met thousands of Jews all the way from Jerusalem to East New York and Melbourne.

I am not oblivious of their faults, as of the faults of other men—their clannishness, acquisitiveness, and aggressiveness. These faults are, in some cases, so accentuated that some of the most disagreeable people I know are Jews. And yet,

I thank God for the Jew. I will tell you why.

In the first place, the Jew has been our greatest prophet. There was a time, some thousands of years ago—before printing, telegraphy, telescopes—when men could see only faintly. The Jew, of all the men of those distant ages, was the prophet—the man who could see. He saw laws of life that mankind is even now only slowly recognizing. He was the great pioneer in the realm of the inner life.

In the next place, I thank God for the Jew, because Jesus was a Jew. No race but the Jewish has produced a man like Jesus, and I doubt if any other race could. It is one of the amusing and tragic chapters in life that Saxons and Slavs persecute Jews, because Jews crucified Jesus. They forget, Jesus was a Jew.

In the third place, I thank God for the Jew because Karl Marx was a Jew. He descended from a long line of rabbis. It is impossible for me to believe that the "Communist Manifesto" did not spring from the idealism of the Hebrew prophets.

When I go about Berlin, New York or London and fall in with social workers, scholars, peacemakers, I find that a large percentage of them are Jews. When I remember Tolstoy—his wide influence—I recall that his greatest work was that of interpreter of a Jew; and Gandhi, perhaps the greatest living spiritual personality, is trying to realize the ideals of Jesus, the Jew.

The Jew wrote the Ten Commandments and described the coming Social State, as in Isaiah. The Jew spoke the Sermon on the Mount, principles for securing peace and prosperity. The Jew in modern life is second to none in efforts to secure social conditions in which human life will be tolerable and sane. While conscious of his faults, I am impelled, when I consider all, to say:

I thank God for the Jew!

SYDNEY STRONG.

We simply can't understand the figures of the depression. Every business estimate seems to indicate that times are better. The automobile industry has been booming all this year, steel production is up, the curve of business activity, with some hitches, is on the whole steadily climbing. Incomes are paying much heavier taxes than they were a year ago, dividend returns are all improving, and savings banks deposits are mounting by the millions. Yet the burden of unemployment grows no lighter, and the burden of relief grows ever heavier. We quote from the editorial page of the New York *Times* two sets of figures which have staggered us. The first has to do with the number of families on relief in June of three successive years, as follows:

June, 1933	3,789,026
June, 1934	3,777,298
June, 1935	3,830,871

The second has to do with the total expenditures for relief, Federal, state, and local, as follows:

June, 1933	$ 66,339,207
June, 1934	125,318,737
June, 1935	169,840,125

To these may be added the facts that the first month of the new fiscal year, July, 1935-36, ended with the largest July deficit for any year since the American army was demobilized in 1919. As we ponder data of this kind, we find ourselves almost completely baffled. If there is anything that guides us to any kind of a solution it is the echoing remembrance of Henry George's old arguments about "progress and poverty"—the rich getting ever richer and the poor ever poorer. There is no question, it seems to us, that business activity is growing, and times thus improving. But there is equally no question, so it again seems to us, that the great masses of the people are reaping no benefit from this improvement. Income is going just where it has always gone—not to the worker at all, but to the landowner, the owner of raw materials and machinery, and the middleman. If the New Deal has helped us, in other words, it has helped only a few of us. Good times and bad times mean nothing except some ripples on the surface, while the great deeps of human misery remain undisturbed.

The declaration of the *New Republic* that, in the crisis precipitated by the collapse of the Roosevelt New Deal program under the hammer blows of the Supreme Court, there is nothing to do but to scrap the Constitution, and with it the federal system of constitutional government which leaves local autonomy to the several states, seems to us to be hasty, to say the

least. It sounds not so much like the statesmanship of a mature man, as the petulance of a child who flings away his toy or smashes his machine when he finds himself unable to run it. There was nothing in the New Deal, it seems to us, which revealed infallible wisdom, and little in the Roosevelt story to indicate that, in either thought or policy, the administration has really exhausted the possibilities of action under a Constitution which has shown itself to be increasingly flexible as the years have gone on. The *New Republic,* it seems to us, is repeating, in a fit of hysterical excitement, its famous feat—which it would so gladly forget these days—of urging the United States in 1916 to go into the Great War to save democracy. For the logic of its present position, in advocating the elimination of the separate states of the Union in favor of the central government, is of course none other than the "totalitarian state" which we see so gloriously exemplified these days in Hitler's Germany. We want many, perhaps most, of the things that the *New Republic* wants in the way of reform, but we think it extravagant to burn down our national house just so as to get our economic roast pig. We are not at all sure that all we want to do cannot be done under our existing federal system, which itself embodies virtues of local control and democratic spirit which seem to us to be quite as important as the very social and economic reforms which we are now advocating. Must we sacrifice the former in order to get the latter? Ridiculous! What we need at this present hour is thought instead of improvisation, statesmanship instead of playing around, constructive genius to match courage and good intention. All we *want* to do we *can* do under our existing constitutional system, granted that we have brains, and a little patience.

In judging Germany, we are in grave danger of exaggerating the importance and influence of the opposition to the Hitler regime. We wonder, for example, how the Nazi leader dares to alienate the millions of men and women in the Protestant and Catholic churches. A recent newspaper reminds us that there are over 21,000,000 Catholics in Germany, and that thus nearly a third of all the people are in the opposition camp. On this basis of thought, there is no reason why we should not add the more than 30,000,000 of Protestants to the Catholics, and then throw in the 600,000 Jews, we know not how many Masons and Communists and Liberals and others, for good measure, and thus demonstrate that not less than 150 per cent of the German people hate Hitler and all his works. We can be saved from such extravaganza only by recognizing that it is sheer folly to count up the opponents of the Nazis in this statistical fashion. The churches in Germany, for example, are state institutions, supported by government funds. People are born into them, and baptized and confirmed in them, by a natural social process. But vast numbers of such members drop away in adult years, and thus represent no real identification with Christianity at all. During the last generation, the exodus from the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, has been enormous. The disillusionments of the War marked the first complete break, and since then the cleavage has steadily widened and deepened. The people now stay away from the churches in droves. Especially are the young people completely alienated. The Nazi drive against the churches, however much it may arouse the priests and pastors, leaves the public absolutely cold. Indeed, there are millions, restive under the taxation for religious purposes, who are more or less openly glad of the religious war. Where has any attack on the churches these days—in Russia, or Mexico, or Spain—been unpopular? Hitler is creating no general enmity by his policies. The masses of the people are as little perturbed by the plight of the Christians as by the plight of the Jews. They like it!

The news from Moscow, that Communists will join front everywhere with Socialists and even liberals in united front against Fascism, is news of first-class importance. The action of the International, in thus casting in its lot with more moderate political elements in capitalistic countries, obviously pushes into the background the idea of world revolution which has been the objective of the Communist Party ever since the great days of Lenin. In place of this now comes the organization of a world labor party to the end of enlisting workers of all countries and of various shades of political opinions, including liberals, the great despised of Communists hitherto, in a battle to the death against Fascism. According to Harold Denny's remarkable report in the New York *Times,* the Communist International is even willing to struggle to save what it calls "the remnants of bourgeois democracy in countries where Fascism threatens it." Says *Pravda,* the chief newspaper of the Russian Communist Party:

> "The most important task of the international workers' movement at the present juncture is to effect a united front for the struggle of the working class. Can Communists wait until a majority of the working class unites on a general program to overthrow capitalism and bring about a victory of proletarian revolution? . . . No, they cannot. It is essential that the struggle against the onslaught of Fascism be organized immediately, for Fascism is our bitterest enemy."

In this announcement of policy, the Bolshevists show themselves, as always, to be realists. Imaginative radicals here in the United States are all the time indulging delusions that Fascism is weak, even in Italy and Germany, because it represents the coercion of a cowering people who will rise in rebellion, any time now, when opportunity offers. This is the silliest kind of a dream, mere wishful thinking. The one supreme

fact about Facism everywhere is its power, first in the organized weapons of terroristic violence, and secondly in the loyalty of peoples trained and drilled to nationalistic enthusiasm. Fascism is the most formidable fact in the world today. A united front against it can alone save our world.

It was significant news which came out of Abyssinia the other day. A body of Italian troops, so the story ran, had camped for the night by a running stream. When the morning came there wasn't any stream—a whole river had stopped running! Instead of the clear, cool water, there was nothing but the dry bed of rocks and dirt. A parched regiment beat a hasty retreat, and reached at last a precarious safety with forty dead and we know not how many wounded. It is perhaps incidents of this character which are disturbing Mussolini and persuading him to turn eyes toward Geneva. Can Italy defeat these native tribesmen who can stop the flow of rivers, and perhaps quite as easily dislodge mountainsides, and scatter deserts, and thread the depths of impenetrable forests? What are tanks worth in such a country, or even bombing planes against such warriors? We have a feeling that the very elaborateness of present-day war machinery, and the vast expense of maintaining the paraphernalia of modern conflict, may in the end make the Ethiopian campaign more difficult even than the three years' dreadful struggle of Great Britain in South Africa. That Mussolini, if he really sets out to do so, can turn Abyssinia into a desert, we have no doubt. That he can destroy the Ethiopian tribes, if he keeps at it long enough, is practically certain. But what is the chance of his being able to sustain a prolonged campaign of extermination without precipitating bankruptcy or a revolt of his own people in outrage against the slaughter of their sons on the savage African front? We prophesy, if this war is allowed to proceed, that Mussolini will be in such military straits by mid-winter that his rule will be threatened for the first time since he gained power. A tortured people, backed by the rebellious conscience of mankind, should give il Duce something to think about on many a winter's night. We would avoid this war at any cost; but, if it comes, there may well be the infinite consolation of one intolerable dictator driven to disaster and death.

The London *Times* wants to know what has really been accomplished practically by the great "National Peace Ballot" completed in England a month ago. This inquiry is skeptical, but we think not unfair. Certainly as a demonstration the poll was impressive, and well justified the Albert Hall mass meeting in which the figures were announced. Five questions were submitted to the British electorate on membership in the League of Nations, the all-round reduction of armaments, the all-round abolition of military air-craft, the prohibition of private profits in armaments, and the measures to be taken against an aggressor nation. A total of 11,627,765 ballots were turned in, and of these an enormous majority voted "yes" to all five of the questions. Thus, 11,157,040 voters, or 95.9 per cent, favored membership in the League; 10,533,826, or 90.6 per cent, favored disarmament; 10,480,002, or 90.1 per cent, voted for the abolition of munitions profits, and so on. The pacifist sentiments of British citizens were thus recorded with overwhelming emphasis. But what of it, asks the London *Times?* "Just what has been achieved in return for the time and trouble that have been lavished upon" this vast exercise in balloting? We know what we really knew before—namely, that men everywhere are opposed to war and all its works, and ardently desire peace. But what are we going to do about it? How are we going to make the League of Nations effective? In what way can a reduction of armaments be begun, to say nothing of being completed? Where is the method of getting rid of military aircraft, and how can munitions be purged of profits? We know what we want—dissent of opinion on matters of objective is negligible. But the practical question of transforming purposes into plans and programs—*that* is the difficulty! The problem of pacifism, in other words is no longer one of sentiment, but of statesmanship. We may at last take for granted the peace convictions of mankind. What now concerns us is registering these convictions in laws and treaties and actions. The fate of mankind waits upon this accomplishment.

The extraordinary case of the *Churchman* in its recent mischance in the courts has aroused a chorus of indignation and outrage from the religious press of this country in which UNITY would fain have voice. Under the able, militant and utterly fearless editorship of Guy Emery Shipler, the *Churchman* has performed many an act of high public service in the field of journalism, for which the people of this country stand immeasurably indebted. In nothing, however, has this great paper been so effective as in its campaign against indecent movies. Like Ezekiel's watchman, the *Churchman* lifted the sentinel's cry of alarm when all the rest of us were asleep or looking elsewhere. Singlehanded it fought the good fight for the protection of the home, of little children, and of the public generally, against the lascivious corruptions of Hollywood. Years before the League of Decency was ever heard of, Dr. Shipler had taken up arms against a foe of vast power and wicked spirit. If in recent months the movies have been cleansed of a considerable proportion of their evils, it is this gallant editor and his weekly paper who deserve the praise. That

the bruised reptile would strike back if it got a chance, of course goes without saying. Unhappily such a chance was given in a technical error, immediately and voluntarily corrected, which led to a libel suit by Gabriel L. Hess, general attorney of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc., which has now led to a verdict against the *Churchman* of $10,000 punitive and $200 actual damages. The enormity of this action has shocked the nation. The outcry of protest and alarm was led by *Editor and Publisher*, the leading trade journal of the daily newspaper profession, and has been joined by the whole body of the religious press. The case has been taken on appeal to the Appellate Court. *Zion's Herald* surmises that, if the verdict is there sustained, "the Christian world . . . (is) likely to be deprived of one of the greatest religious journals of the century." We do not ourselves believe that the verdict will be sustained. If it is, we feel sure that friends everywhere will promptly raise Mr. Hess's blood money, and save the *Churchman*. Meanwhile, we hail a brave editor and noble Christian gentleman.

European Notes

IV

The "Notes" from Germany, as published in recent issues of this paper, have been entertaining I hope, but have touched upon none of the vital matters upon which our readers have been undoubtedly eager to be informed. There have been reasons for the perhaps disappointing character of what I have written.

First of all, until this present article, which is the last of my little series, all that I have written was set down in Germany, where prudence dictates that nothing shall be written, as nothing can be spoken or published, of a nature critical of the present regime. American newspaper correspondents in Germany telephone their stuff out of the country on international wires to Paris or London over which the Reich has no control. I had no access to such channels, but could only use the censored mails. Furthermore, while treated everywhere with the greatest courtesy, and never conscious at any time of being under observation, I could never forget I was in a country where the secret police act suddenly, and frequently without reason. I, therefore, resolved to have in my possession no notes or papers which might appear suspicious to Nazi eyes. In Germany, as in Russia, I kept my thoughts within the precincts of my mind.

Secondly, while in Germany, seeking impressions and studying conditions, I found myself at the beginning and increasingly to the end in a state of vast confusion. Everything I had thought or imagined about Germany was subject, like a railroad time table, to "change without notice." I had resolutely resolved to take into Germany none of my previous conceptions and opinions—to remember nothing of what I had read, and as little as possible of what I had myself said. I proposed to keep an open mind, and come to conclusions as fresh as the experiences which I knew that I would have. The result was for the moment chaos. Every idea, if not actually changed, was at least modified—sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. Under such conditions it was impossible—and would have been unfair, had it been possible—to report anything in the way of judgment upon the case of Nazi Germany. I must wait until I could bring my impressions into some state of order, and find out what they really meant. This I have not yet done. It will be some time before I shall be ready to report, either here or elsewhere, what I think about Germany in the light of what I have myself seen and therefore now know at first hand. But meanwhile there are a few facts which seem to me to be clear, and which I venture therefore to set down. At bottom, now that I have gone into Germany, and looked the Nazis in the face, and listened to what they have to say and seen what they have done and are doing, I feel, like Omar Khayyam. that I have

"(Come) out by the same door wherein I went."

None the less, there is a different color about it all, and surely, I hope, a truer understanding.

I have spoken of "confusion"! This confusion sprang from a conflict between what, on the one hand, I had expected to find in Hitler's Reich and what, on the other hand, struck me as unexpected, strange, and baffling. This country was all that I had anticipated from two years' careful reading of letters, newspaper reports, articles, books, but also it was something else which at first I did not understand and even now find it difficult to believe.

The familiar aspects of the Nazi rule were all present. They are so well-known that I need only mention them, for they are no longer news.

Thus, there is the terror which surrounds one like an atmosphere, and exhausts one like the humidity of a blistering day in summer. This does not mean that the secret police intrude upon the lives of the great masses of the people in city and in country—they do not! But they are there as a presence not seen but felt, and in the case of groups which are suspect or under the ban, they are like unknown watchers in the background, or dogs hunting out a trail. I have to confess that I was more conscious of the terror in Germany than I ever was in Russia. To sit with a friend in a cafe and have him stop talking the moment a stranger came within ear-shot, to confer with some

personage and see him looking suspiciously right and left at every turn of the conversation, to visit a home and be denied information until the servants had gone home, to seek out an underground Communist and go through adventures like a character in a melodrama—these are experiences which I shall never forget.

Then, there is the war upon the Jews, which is the most tragic and terrible thing I have ever seen in my life. Its circumstances are not violence and bloodshed—these occasionally appear, but are not on the whole important. For the anti-Semitic war is not so much a pogrom as a program. It is not an attack upon and extinction of the Jews all at once, but a slow, grinding process of gradual extermination. In spite of political outlawry, social prejudice, industrial disadvantage, occasional violence and open persecution, unceasing insults, humiliations and slanders, the present generation of Jews in Germany is managing to live. But the end is in sight—for them, and certainly for their children. I visited and talked with many Jews in many places, and everywhere I found patience, courage, strange sweetness of temper, and utter despair. Three things are to be said about this Jewish situation: first, Hitler's policy is fixed, and therefore permanent; secondly, this policy is bad, and steadily as time goes on will be worse; and thirdly, it has the support of the great masses of the people who have been taught, by the cleverest and most ruthless propaganda agencies in the world, to fear and hate the Jews.

Also, there is the religious war—the fiercely calculated attacks upon the churches, both Catholic and Protestant. These attacks spring, first, from the determination of the Nazi government to rule the churches in its own political interest, brooking no opposition and interference; and, secondly, from the growing influence of the so-called "paganist" movement, which is a deliberate attempt to oust Christianity from the consciousness of the German people. On my last Sunday in the Reich I witnessed a little scene in this tremendous drama, when I saw a preacher shut out of his pulpit by police order, and the congregation sent into the streets. The cause of the churches, like that of the Jews, I must feel, is hopeless. Hitler is determined to have his way, and he is going to succeed at no matter what terrible price.

The economic situation in Germany, is of course, bad. Wages are low, and getting lower. Standards of living are steadily declining. The decrease in unemployment is specious and temporary. The financial problems of the state are getting ever more desperate. But these conditions are familiar—they may be encountered in every country in Europe! Furthermore, I have been taught by experience running all the way from the Great War to Mussolini not to lay too much stress upon what seems to be the impending bankruptcy of government. Somehow or other, these governments seem to get along, whatever the financial stress. At any rate, the economic plight of Germany seemed nothing new or strange to me, and threatened nothing which impressed me as in any way immediate.

But there is another side to all this which surprised me, baffled me, and still amazes me. In the matter of the Jews, the Christians, the workers, as I have said, I saw nothing for which I was not amply prepared. But in other matters I saw, or thought I saw, phenomena which threw me for the moment into complete confusion.

Thus, I seemed to see a new spirit in great masses of the German people. At least I would not have known them for the same people I saw in 1922 and 1931. As a matter of fact, they are *not* the same people. In the post-war period of Germany, from 1919 to 1933, everything was in chaos. There was the outward chaos of economic ruin, political confusion, social disintegration, all untouched by inept and purposeless leadership. This was matched by the inward chaos of humiliation, shame, bewilderment, despair, and a great fear. Under the impact of defeat in the war, disgrace in the peace, and the long torture of a world's revenge, the Germans simply went to pieces. And now they seem to be pulling themselves together again! At any rate, there is order, discipline, morale, and more than one indication of confidence and content. The idea of Germany as a vast population of people cowed and tamed, browbeaten and bullied by a crowd of gangsters, simply is not true. There are millions of Germans who cry "Heil Hitler" not because they have to, but because they want to.

Again, to my vast surprise, I became convinced, wholly against my wish, that the Nazi regime is sustained not so much now by the terror as by an ever-growing body of public support. This does not mean that there are not large areas of disaffection, unrest and bitter hostility. Jews, confessional Christians, Roman Catholics, underground Communists and Socialists, liberals, intellectuals, and grumbling workers, these would seem to represent a formidable body of opinion. But all of these elements put together do not affect the general situation in any decisive way. We sometimes wonder how Hitler *dares* to persecute and punish as he does these outlawed groups in the community. The answer is easy! He does this because he knows that, in these outrageous proceedings, he has the support of millions who are enthusiastically with the government, especially when it hunts Jews and Communists, and even Catholics. Especially is this true of the myriads of young people, the new generation, who in Germany, as in Russia, are being drilled and trained into a great body of fanatical loyalists.

The position of the liberals in Germany I found particularly significant in this regard. Such liberals as I saw—cultured, enlightened, intelligent men and

women, of open minds and independent spirits—had been opposed to the Nazis in the beginning, and are not now members of the Party, but not a few are supporters, and sometimes enthusiastic supporters, of the regime. One such liberal, a man of fine mind and noble spirit, with American experience behind him, explained his point of view to me. "I am with Hitler," he said, "because I now see clearly that he saved Germany from chaos. In 1933, it was either the Nazis or utter ruin. Also," he added, "I believe that Hitler and his colleagues have done wonderful things for Germany since they took control. I regret some things terribly—the treatment of the Jews, for example, and all this re-arming for war. But these things are overborne by the good achieved by the Nazis in a hundred different directions. On their record of achievement," he concluded, "I think the Nazis are entitled to the support of all good Germans."

Along with this firm support of the Nazi rule goes the personal adulation of the Nazi leader. It was inevitable that I should interpret this at first as obedience to orders. But as time went on I felt myself persuaded that there is much in it that is genuine. Orders can win obedience—yes; but they cannot stir ecstasy. Tyranny can exact recognition, but never passionate acclaim. Well, again and again I seemed to feel this note of ecstasy, and meet this spectacle of acclaim. Millions of people in Germany not only believe in Hitler, but love him, and worship him. They regard him as the Savior, and deify him as the Romans deified their emperors. Not otherwise can I explain the rapturous, almost insane crowds which engulf Hitler whenever he appears in any part of the country. And certainly not otherwise can I explain "der Fuehrer's" immunity from bodily attack as he appears constantly in public unguarded save by the multitudes that wrapt him 'round. This may shock us, but why should it amaze us? When we remember what a Corsican corporal did with the French people in the nineteenth century, why should we be surprised at what an Austrian housepainter is doing with the German people in the twentieth?

Now it is these facts which overwhelmed and still overwhelm me. I can think of nothing quite so important to report about modern Germany as this new spirit of the people in support of Hitler and his regime. Other things we know, but this is *news* or at least it was to me! Of course, it is tragic news, unwelcome news, disillusioning news. It shatters our hopes, and dissipates all our fond ideas that what we don't like must be disliked by everybody. But this seems to me to be no reason for denying it, or seeking to hide it, or undertaking to persuade ourselves that it is not so. To me this fact of Hitler's popularity is more terrible than the terror itself. Just for that reason do I want to see it as it is—and understand it.

The explanation of this extraordinary situation is at least three-fold:

First, there is the terror, which in the beginning subdued the people to a submission which has become a habit, and which now is seen by great masses of people as a force directed not so much against themselves as against others whom they hate, despise, and fear. Does anybody imagine that Hitler is courting unpopularity by his policy of repression and suppression of Jews and Communists and even the churches? On the contrary, this policy is the surest road to popular favor. The great majority of the German people are anti-Semitic, anti-Communist, and either anti-Church or utterly indifferent to things religious. The terror, therefore, in its most dramatic and rigorous use, is the very thing to win and hold the support of the masses, strange as it may seem.

Secondly, there is the work of censorship and propaganda. Two full years of highly organized skillfully directed and exclusive agitation on behalf of the existing regime have done their work. On the one hand, the people have been denied knowledge of much that is going on—they hear only what the government wants them to hear. Nothing confused and amazed me more in Germany than to refer casually to events which had long been familiar to me, but which I discovered had never been heard of by my friends. On the other hand, the people have been fed up, day after day, month after month, with the glory, beneficence and power of the Nazi rule. Before them constantly has been spread the spectacle of "the New Germany." This two-fold influence has at last created a state of mind which more and more tends toward enthusiasm for "der Fuehrer" and his regime. Everywhere in this country I seem to find persons who assume that the Germans are exactly the same today, in their minds and hearts, as they were a dozen years ago. That two years of the most intensive propaganda, in other words, ever directed upon the public mind, has been absolutely without effect! How can we imagine such a thing, delude ourselves with such a fancy, when we remember (if we *do* remember!) what censorship and propaganda did to *us* during the days of the Great War?

Lastly, there is the fundamental fact of history, the vast processes of psychical and social experience. We can best understand Hitler's present power, it seems to me, by recalling the story of his rise to power. Why did the Nazi leader gain the chancellorship and with it the dictatorship of the Reich, when all the world was laughing at him, and prophesying the imminent collapse of his movement and his own speedy disappearance from public view? Hitler, as we now know, was no laughing matter in those days. And the reason was that he met the need of the German people, answered the most passionate longings of their souls. For years they had been down-trodden, humiliated, desper-

ate. In their national life they had suffered every experience of wretchedness and ruin. In their international relations, they saw themselves cast down as a despised and pariah people. From the Allies they had been taught to expect no mercy; from their own government they were learning to expect no guidance or deliverance. They seemed lost, bound, helpless, hopeless. Then appeared this eloquent and (as they thought) heroic man, who promised to lead them out of the wilderness. All they feared, he defied; all they yearned for, he fulfilled. And they leaped to him as to a Savior. Four years ago, in 1931, I came back from Germany and made myself unpopular by prophesying that nothing could stop Hitler. I was right, because I had felt the power of this appeal, and witnessed the disintegration of the opposition.

Now, what was true of Hitler's rise to power is true today of his possession of power. I should like to believe, as I once believed, that Hitler is supreme because he wields the weapons of a terror which a rebellious people are for the moment helpless to overcome. But there is this other and more potent force! The people feel, or have been made to feel, that Hitler has restored the national prestige, delivered the land from chaos and Communism, and thus given Germany once again her rightful place among the nations of the earth. They are conscious, after years of struggle and suffering without avail, of control, direction, organization, to some end which they may not understand but which is associated with the great traditions of the Reich. They are sure they are no longer drifting aimlessly through ignominy to ruin, but are firmly held in the clutch of an iron hand which may lead them through pride to glory. The relief of this sensation to the German people, after all the years which they have experienced of weakness and despair, is an ineffable one. Like a suffering and long neglected invalid, in the care at last of physician and nurse, they feel hope again, and are lifted up in courage. What to us may seem to be tyranny is to them care; what we call terror they regard as a rigorous regime of social therapeutics necessary for recovery to health. After all these years of floundering and falling, the Germans feel such inexpressible satisfaction at being taken in hand, and told what to do, that they are ready to forgive and forget all else. Hence the new spirit which is everywhere abroad in Germany. After being knocked down, trampled upon, wounded and robbed, and all but murdered, the Germans feel that rescue has come, that they are on their feet again—and myriads of them rejoice!

Writes a friend to me on this whole problem: "Even the radicals will understand in time that the dictatorship is based on blind loyalty to a savior of natural self-esteem as well as on blood and iron."

It is because of these facts that I do not believe that Germany can be explained solely in terms of the terror. With Hitler, as with Mussolini, there is this psychology of the masses which is perhaps the most formidable fact in the situation. We neglect it because we do not see it at this distance, and also because we do not want to see it. But I felt it, or seemed to feel it, and I can make no honest report which does not confess it.

Hitler's position today is menaced, as all Europe is menaced, by forces of economic disintegration and collapse. A financial crisis of major proportions would shake his rule—a disastrous foreign war would destroy it. But these facts do not affect his present rule and its vitalizing impact upon great masses of the people. To doubt or to deny Hitler's immediate power today, in spite of oppressed and disaffected groups, is to commit the same folly of which we were guilty yesterday when we doubted or denied his rise to power.

Hitler's Germany is the most formidable fact in contemporary Europe. The Reich, rather than Russia, is the country to watch as the center at this hour of world destiny. Russia is moving slowly, and the hour of her preponderant influence is still far away. But Germany is swiftly arriving in the most feverish revival of nationalism in our time. What in the next few years she does, or does not do, may determine the history of mankind for centuries to come.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

O World!

O World, how love we less than all
Thy spacious lands and seas?
How hear we not our country's call
As far as flows the breeze?
How lives our loyalty the less
Toward all the sons of men
Than pity answers to distress?
Or hope to hope again?

O World, we lay our hatreds down,
We put our prides away;
We share all glory of renown,
All shame of yesterday;
One Country, and one Humankind,
One flag, all flags above,
One fellowship of mind with mind,
One blend of love with love.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Blazers of Brotherhood

(To Sacco and Vanzetti)
(*In Memoriam*)

You are the stalwart, lonely ones
The world sends forth along the trail.
Beyond convention's garrisons
You seek the perfect Grail.

You mow each rank and poisonous weed
That blocks our stumbling human road,
The choking plants of hate and greed
The servile years have sowed.

Your trail is yet beyond our reach,
Blazers of brotherhood who dare!
We lift to you our faltering speech
And chime our prayer.

LUCIA TRENT.

Religion in Education*

Religion was once defined by an American Educationist (Horne, "The Philosophy of Education") as "the recognition in life of the Ideal Person." The definition, by stressing the natural tendency in humanity to create either actual or imaginary embodiments of desired perfection, strikes the mean between the uncritical reception of revelation which nineteenth century science made difficult for questioning minds, and the materialistic rationalism which twentieth century science has made difficult for the successors of those questioning minds or for minds like my own which survived the first era and retain their interrogative capacity in the present. The clash of these two forces in human life—of valid incursions from beyond the horizon of normal experience and of criticism of the grounds of their validity—always observable in human history, has become more widely felt than ever before through the vast development of means of broadcasting knowledge and ideas from cathedral and church, from observatory and laboratory. This has brought uncertainty into the atmosphere in which youth finds its capacities seeking efflorescence, and this uncertainty is as marked in India, where I write, as anywhere else.

It is not yet clear what the record of religious climatology is going to be in the near future; whether the blessing of abundant rain of inspiration and aspiration is going to draw a new fruitfulness out of life, or whether a prolonged drought is going to bring spiritual barrenness and poverty. I am on the side of hope. Whatever happens in the coming spiritual weather of mankind, I feel a movement of possibility which, if wisely influenced by education, can carry humanity beyond the danger of flood or famine to a condition of balance in which the sunlight of intellectual illumination, the pressure of creative expression, and the rainfall of critical cleansing, acting on the ground of human nature, can make the desert "rejoice and blossom as the rose." That movement is the movement towards a complete education in which the aspirational nature of the student will be as closely attended to as the mental is today, and as the aesthetical is not yet.

Religion in education must rise out of educational necessity. If, through a swing of the pendulum, as has sometimes happened, it was forced into education from outside, if it became a creedal or sectarian power of a separating kind, it would only intensify the irreligious relationships of the religions today, and populate the earth with two main classes of individuals—those who flatly deny religion, and those who, for ulterior reasons, pretend to accept it; that is, skeptics on the one hand and hypocrites on the other. If, however, religion continues to be closed out of education, the result will only be a deeper depression of idealism and conduct than we have at present, and a state of barbarism more debased than that of the past because equipped with more potent means of mutual destruction; and this not through the rejection of religion as such, but through the renunciation of reverence and discipline which have been immemorially associated with the practice, as distinct from the profession of religion.

The problem of religion in education is the problem of allowing fulfilment of the aspirational impulse that is in all normal human beings, and at the same time recognizing the worth and place of the organized religions as the historical expressions of man's search for a reality felt to exist beyond the edge of conscious human capacity and experience. The educational solution of the problem lies in the fulfilment of the necessities of the full nature of the student.

The physical and mental necessity are well looked after; but the quality of the results is debased by ulterior selfish motives underlying the acquisition of physical or mental power.

Emotional education is only in its beginnings. Emotion is an expansive force, a tension of the psyche, which moves towards its fulfilment in two main directions. In one direction it moves towards relieving its tension in objects fabricated by the individual. This is the way of art-expression, the objectifying of creative emotion in a form suitable to the endowment of the individual. At present, in educationally free countries, it is an appendix to education. Its destiny is to become as integral as mother-tongue. In India it is nowhere. In the other direction emotion seeks relief away from external objects by merging the being of the individual in the larger Life of the Universe. This is the way of religious aspiration, the stretching of the finite in human bonds towards its native infinity. The experience of this tension, this hunger for infinity, and the glimpsing of its satisfaction, are common to all the religions, and are, in fact, the vital basis of their inner unity, despite the diversity of their expression, mentally in doctrine, dynamically in observance.

From the point of view, therefore, of complete education, it is impossible to omit from it the means to the satisfaction of the aspirational hunger of the student. Education must logically include religion.

Three objections are ordinarily made to religion in education. One comes from the side of education, to the effect that education should be completely free from the tendency of the religions to separate people, and be left to deal only with the mind (and recently with the body) of the student. But if the recognition of the religious necessity, and if the demand now being made for the complete education of the individual, are based on reality, this objection would appear to have no validity. To maintain it on the ground of a separative tendency in religion is to maintain that no essential human activity on which humanity differs should be maintained. This would reduce humanity to non-entity.

The second objection comes from the side of religion; that is, the objection, in educational in-

*The author of this article is President of Madanapalle College, Madras Presidency, South India. In December last the annual Conference of the South Indian Teachers' Union conferred on him the ancient and highly honored Sanskrit title of Kulapathi, which may be translated, "Teacher of Multitudes," but has a qualitative as well as quantitative connotation. In January, Kulapathi Cousins gave a course of lectures on educational fundamentals in the Extension Department of the Osmania University in Hyderabad, the capital of the Dominions of the Muhammadan Nizam. The following article is based on a section of one of the lectures. Its message is as pertinent to America as to India.—EDITOR.

stitutions under specifically religious control, to any form of religious expression other than that professed by the institution. This is an understandable position on the part of a particular faith. It is, as I see it, better that the religious necessity of humanity be separately expressed than not expressed at all. But obviously such religious reservation in an educational institution should apply only to members of its particular faith. If it invites members of other faiths to join its staff or roll, it should make provision for their religious necessity also.

The third objection comes from the side of educational authority. It holds that its duty is to be neutral in regard to religion, and construes religious neutrality, in India, as making no provision for the satisfaction of the spiritual needs of students on the ground of ceremonial and doctrinal differences. If religion is, as I believe, a fundamental human necessity, then the neutrality of exclusion is on the logical level of excluding food from a hostel on the ground of different ways and different tastes in food.

So far as I can realize the situation, looking at it purely from the point of view of educational necessity, I can find no really convincing case against religion in education. My own experience, apart from speculative argument, has brought me to the conviction that religion should be an integral part of education. It has also brought me to a technique of religion in education that has in it, I believe, the possibility of solving the problem as between a universal human necessity and a historically evolved restriction. It is possible, as I know from daily experience as the head of a College and of primary and secondary schools attended by students of the Hindu, Moslem and Christian faiths, to begin each day's work with an act of common aspiration that makes the day nobler and sweeter than it otherwise would be. There are in the literatures of all the faiths expressions of aspiration so general that the followers of any other faith can reach out through them towards the universal life.

But besides this general aspiration, with its purifying effect on the emotional atmosphere, students should, where necessary, have instruction in the tenets and observances of their faith, and should also, I suggest, have some indication of similar tenets in other faiths. In the college curriculum there should be periods for the comparative study of the religions, not as an optional, but as a cultural necessity.

To me there is no doubt as to the beneficial effect of religion wisely included in education, or of the unifying effect that joint general aspiration and sympathetically disposed study of the religions would, through the students when they became adults, ultimately have on the social life of humanity. And I feel equally certain that an education which made religion one of its integral parts would itself exercise a beneficial effect on the relationship between the religions by evoking a spirit of reverence towards life in all its phases of wonder and beauty, a reverence that would surmount the divisions that thought and feeling tend to set up, and bring the religions nearer each other in essentials and in joint effort to apply their common fundamentals to the solution of the pressing problems of daily life. To exalt the essential truths in the religions, and to depress the non-essentials, is to break exclusiveness that is always based on superstition, and to prepare the way of the future world-religion. JAMES H. COUSINS.

The Fascination of the Sea

When the hot summer days come and nights that do not refresh, is there any call that is so fascinating, so irresistible, as that of the great, cool, ever-welcoming sea?

It is rather startling to call to mind that the globe on which we live is primarily one of water, not of land; that three-fourths of its surface is sea; that probably once there was no land at all; that the sea is not water which had its origin on land, but that the land has risen up out of the sea. If Mars, or any other of our sister planets, is inhabited by intelligent beings, and if by means of powerful telescopes or otherwise they have obtained any considerable amount of knowledge of our earth, it is quite likely that they are accustomed to think and speak of it as that strange mainly-water-covered planet.

We often speak of the ocean as a vast waste,—a part of the globe almost wholly without use or value. The Arabs go so far as to represent it as not a part of creation at all, but as so much of the earth abstracted, neglected or left over, when the creation was finished. Hence, they feel an aversion to it. It must have been some such feeling in the mind of the writer of the Apocalypse, or Book of Revelation, that caused him to represent the perfect world which is to come by and by, as one in which there will be "no more sea."

But, as a fact, *is* the sea a waste and useless part of our earth? So far from that, it is as important as the land. Indeed, without it, as we all know, the land itself would not sustain life. A world without a sea is a dead world. We seem to have an illustration of such a world in our near sky-neighbor, the moon, which is believed to contain no life because it contains no water.

The earth, as we see it today, is largely the creation of the sea. Emerson makes the sea sing of itself:

> I, with my hammer pounding evermore
> The wavy coast, smite Andes into dust,
> Strewing my bed; and, in another age,
> Rebuilt a continent of better men.

All the continents of the earth have been built by the sea. Nearly all the solid crust of the earth, so far as we know it, is made up of stratified rock. But all stratified rock has been formed in water, which means, has been formed by sea deposits. Thus the sea is the universal mother. Even the highest mountain peaks are her children.

As we know, the clouds come mainly from the sea. That means that the rains, and the snows, and the springs in the hills, and the rivers that flow through the valleys, are born of the sea. Thus it is the sea that fertilizes all lands. The sea also modifies climates. It cools the breezes of summer and warms those of winter, and gives pure air, tonic and health to the world.

The sea contributes enormously to the world's

wealth, because it is the highway over which so large a part of the commerce and trade of the nations is borne. If you could strip the world of its sea-borne trade, you would rob it of a large proportion of its commercial and industrial prosperity.

We little realize how much of the world's wealth is in and under the sea. We talk about the exhaustion of our coal and oil fields. There are probably much greater resources of both oil and coal under the ocean than on land. The same is true of iron, gold, silver, and all the metals. Future elevations of sea-bottoms to the surface, as the result of geological changes, will undoubtedly bring more or less of these sources of mineral wealth within each reach of man. But what is of still greater importance, more and more men will learn to discover and obtain them even though they are under the sea, for man's power over nature is as yet only in its morning.

But probably the greatest value of the sea for man will always be found in its food products. The sea is actually more abundantly stocked with living creatures than the land.

Recently a fleet of five small fishing vessels brought into the New York harbor, as the result of a single night's catch, as much wholesome food as would be equivalent to fifty fat cattle or three hundred sheep. Nor was this an unusual experience. It is demonstrated that many of the better fishing grounds of the world yield a hundred times as much human food per acre annually as is produced from the best cultivated farming lands; for they yield their harvests all the year 'round, whereas the land yields its harvest only once or twice a year.

But vast as is the quantity of food that the sea now furnishes to the human race, its future yield is certain to be far greater. As Professor Agassiz used to tell his students, we shall learn to "farm the sea" to an extent not now dreamed of. Exterminating the sharks and other destroyers of life that now infest it, and stocking its waters with fish and other forms of life useful to men, as we are already doing our rivers and inland lakes, we shall make it a vast harvest field, hardly second in importance to the land itself.

To him who knows the sea it has endless interest. There are rivers in the sea—rivers far more vast than our Mississippis or Amazons, keeping in their own well defined channels, filled with their own life, carrying with them their own climate, flowing for thousands of miles across great oceans. There are mountains in the sea quite as high and valleys quite as deep and broad as any on land. There are vast floating islands on the sea. There are immense forests in the sea. There are sea-deeps filled with vegetable growths and with coral formations as brilliant with color as our northern woods in autumn. There are tropical seas bright and warm with sunshine all the year round, and icy polar seas bordered with glaciers, terrible with cold, and dark with a six months' night.

Beneath the sea are buried cities, islands, continents. We talk of the "Lost Atlantis." The great past has seen not one Atlantis but probably scores disappear beneath the ocean's waves. And from those waves as many new lands have risen.

What histories lie at the bottom of the sea! Some years ago when in Greece, I found the Greek Government planning to dredge the Bay of Salamis, with the hope of getting new data concerning the famous sea fight there that stopped the Persian invader from overrunning Greece and perhaps Europe. If the bottom of the Aegean Sea or the Adriatic or the Mediterranean or the North Sea could be thoroughly explored, what stories would be found written there! If the Atlantic Ocean were dry, I suppose we could well nigh trace the path of the slave ships that once plied between Africa and this country by the bones of the poor victims that died on the passage and were thrown like dead dogs into the deep. If the Atlantic were dry how eagerly would the localities be searched where the Lusitania went down, and the Titanic, and a score of other ships laden with precious human freight that our generation remembers so well! To how many of the best and bravest men and women of the world have all the great oceans given graves,—navigators pushing out across unknown deeps to discover new lands; emigrants from the old world coming to the new, to turn its wilderness into a land of homes and of civilization; missionaries sailing away to distant lands to carry the story of the Cross! In the "last day," when "the sea shall give up its dead," what revelations will there be!—revelations of glory and honor, and revelations of shame!

How different are the emotions with which different persons regard the sea! Whether men love it, hate it, or are indifferent to it, is a matter partly of association and education and partly of temperament. To those who have always lived at a distance from it the sea is often a dread and a terror. But to many whose childhood has been spent within the sound of its waters, and who have grown familiar with its ways, there is nothing else in nature so fascinating.

Have not many of us who live near the sea or who often visit it had experiences similar to that of Waldo in Olive Schreiner's "An African Farm"?

> I got to the beach that afternoon, and I saw the water run up and down on the sand, and I saw the white foam breakers. They were pretty, but I thought I would go away. It was not my sea.
>
> But I began to like it when I sat by it that night in the moonlight; and the next day I liked it better, and before I left I loved it. It was not like the sky and stars, that talk of what has no beginning and no end; but it is so human. Of all the things I have ever seen, only the sea is like a human being; the sky is not, nor the earth. But the sea is always moving; always something deep in itself is stirring it. It never rests; it is always wanting, wanting, wanting. It hurries on, and then it creeps back slowly without having reached, moaning. It is always asking a question, and it never gets the answer. I can hear it in the day and in the night; the white foam breakers are saying that which I think. I walk alone with them when there is no one to see me, and I sing with them. I lie down on the sand, and watch them with my eyes half shut. The sky is better, but it is so high above our heads! I love the sea.

We all see according to what we are. We find in nature what we bring. Especially is this true of the sea. To early man the sea meant little, except something to dread and fear,—as it means little to the savage today. But as man arises in civilization, as his life becomes larger and deeper; the sea becomes more and more to him, not only for its physical uses, but also for its spiritual. It takes on deeper meanings, speaks with more impressive voices, appeals to him with richer and richer symbolism.

How wonderful is the beauty of the sea! Who can describe it?—the splendor of its sunsets; the shimmer of its waters under the full moon; the dance of the stars in its waves; the toss of its white spray; the dash of its mighty billows on the rocks; the lights and shadows that forever play across its face; its eternally changing colors! Tennyson calls the sea "The silent, sap-

phire spangled, marriage ring of the land." Emerson calls it:

> The opaline, the plentiful, the strong
> Yet beautiful as is the rose in June.

The sea is a musical instrument. It is nature's vast organ, ten thousand times mightier than all the organs of man, forever playing its forever changing music,—now soft as a mother's lullaby, now loud and awful as a hundred Niagaras. If you would understand the full mystery, range and power of this music, you must listen to it both in calm and in storm, in all seasons of the year, out on the broad ocean where the great waves roll unbroken for hundreds of miles and also on all shores, where now they lisp softly on sandy beaches, and now fling themselves with fury against gigantic and pitiless rocks. If you would compare your own emotions awakened by this vast music and your own interpretation of its spiritual significance with those of great musical masters, go and listen to Rubenstein's mighty "Ocean Symphony" as some years ago it was produced in Boston by the Boston Symphony Orchestra, or, better still, go and acquaint yourself by patient study with Edward Alexander MacDowell's eight exquisite and wonderful "Sea Pieces."

The sea is always the same, yet never the same. Today it is a wild beast, seeking to devour whatever comes in its way. Tomorrow it is a lover, tenderly caressing the shore, or the boat that is borne lightly on its bosom. Its waves reflect every mood of the human soul. They leap with joy; they sob with grief. They shriek with rage, with defiance; they are peaceful and calm with repose and trust. They are cruel and treacherous like hate; they are strong and protecting like the arms of love.

Who has experienced a storm on the sea at night, —as it has been my fortune to experience more than once—when the darkness was like that of Egypt, and the winds raged, and the waters were mad, and the batteries of the thunder crashed, and the white lightning split the ink-black sky to shivers every instant, and every shock of the mighty waves made your boat stagger and moan, and the night seemed endless! Who has been on the sea when the winds were gentle, and the waves chased each other like happy children; when by day the sun shone, and by night the sky was bright with stars, and the air was June, and the hours flew by like happy birds, and the cares and troubles of the world were put far away and forgotten, and peace, perfect peace, came down upon the soul, and made you to dwell in heaven? Have you had these experiences? Then you know the sea, its fascination, its mystery, its companionship, its terror; its power.

One cannot long study the sea without being impressed by the fact that in all ages it has been a wonderful field—perhaps the greatest that has existed—for the development of courage, for the nursing of heroes.

The hardships of the sea have always made men strong: the perils of the sea have always made them daring. Think of the sailor sailing the seas in all weathers, guiding the helm and reefing sail, by day and night, summer and winter, in sunshine and in storm. Think of the whalers, in the perils and hardships of the arctic seas. Think of explorers, like Columbus, and Cabot, and Magellan and Captain Cook, and Nansen and Peary, Byrd and their crews, braving unknown oceans, and pushing on and on through dangers which would have appalled any but the stoutest hearts! Think of the heroism today displayed by the seamen of all our life saving stations.

When will men learn that the finest heroisms of the world are those of peace, not those of war,—the heroisms that save, not those that destroy?

One of the most interesting things about the sea is the strange fact that it is proving itself to be the great bringer-together, the great uniter, of nations,—probably the greatest of all influences tending to promote ultimate world-unity and world-brotherhood. In the early ages of the world, this was not so; it could not be. Then the sea divided. It tended to destroy human brotherhood rather than to promote it. The sea was the great barrier. Nations on different sides of large bodies of water had little or no intercourse with one another, and could have little or none, because they could not cross the great barrier. By and by they learned to build boats, and so got partial mastery. But not until modern times did the boats grow sufficiently large and strong to give safe passage over the ocean. Indeed not until the birth and development of the steamship, quite in our own day, did men obtain real mastery of the sea. As soon as that was secured, the sea became no longer a divider but a uniter of men and nations. Now the land that fronts the sea fronts the world. The sea has become the world's great highway. It invites men to travel. It invites nations to engage in commerce and trade with one another. Thus it creates mutual interests between nation and nation.

Until our modern age the world was not one. There were a lot of parts of a world—all the lands were such —but they were simply fragments; in no sense were they united into a whole. Indeed until a very recent period entire continents were not even known to exist by the peoples of other continents,—the two great Americas and vast Australia having sailed into the ken of Europe and Asia out of the unknown less than five centuries ago.

What was it that thus, almost up to our own day, not only separated vast lands from vast lands by impassible barriers, but virtually blotted them out of existence, so far as knowledge of them by the rest of the world was concerned. It was the dark, wide, mysterious, unmastered sea, which stretched out and out from every shore, nobody knew how far, nobody knew whither, and held in its awful bosom nobody knew what secrets and nobody could dream what perils.

Now how great and marvelous the change! Not only have the distances, the ignorance and the separations disappeared, but this same sea is the actual cause. The hider has become the revealer; the separator has become the uniter. This same sea which, unmastered, spurned man, defied him, drowned him, wrecked his argosies, hid from him half the world, and broke the world into unrelated fragments, now, in our modern age, having become mastered by man through his science and his ships, has become his friend and his docile servant, has not only lifted up into his view every land of earth hidden behind whatsoever mysterious horizon, but has actually constituted itself a bridge, solid as granite, joining together all lands,—thus making the world for the first time one world, and all the nations, peoples and races on its surface for the first time a human family.

True, on the sea today we see something else, that is dark and ominous. Side by side with the commerce of the seas, which tends to unite nations, we see great navies, which tend to divide, to alienate, to alarm, to create enmity, hate and war, instead of good will and brotherhood.

Will this always continue? We cannot believe it. Surely the savagery that takes pride in such engines of death and destruction will pass away, and enlightened men will come to see that battleships are not a part of a nation's glory, but of its shame. Then, little by little, these symbols of barbarism and unreason will fade away like the shadows of the night, and in their place the sea will grow populous with craft, which, plying backward and forward, like shuttles, over all the waters of the world, will weave the nations together into a brotherhood of mutual interests, and growing sympathies, and peace.

The sea suggests *aspiration.* Its waves seem to be forever endeavoring to climb, to climb. Though they sink they always rise again, and give the impression of continually reaching on and up, as if to grasp something beyond and above themselves. May they not well teach us men and women to climb too,—forever to press toward the unattained?

Perhaps nothing else in nature, unless it be the night sky, is so full of intimations of the Infinite and the Eternal as the sea. To those who love it, it often suggests Wordsworth's lines:

In a season of calm weather
Though inland far we be,
Our souls have sight of that immortal sea
Which brought us hither,
Can in a moment travel thither,
And see the children sport upon the shore,
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore.

Thus it is that, to those who can hear, the sea speaks forever of deeps beyond its deeps, of power beyond its power, and of those infinities and eternities of man's soul and of God, of which it is perhaps the most impressive of all known symbols.

There are other seas beside the physical.

Life is a sea. It is a sea upon which we are all voyaging. Sometimes sunshine and peaceful waters are around us, sometimes fogs and darkness, and sometimes wild waves and storms. But there is no stopping or going back.

Death is a sea. Upon it all must sail. Our friends are launching; when will our turn come? And when we go, will it be to a sure land beyond the sea? If so, where will the land be? And what? Oh, the mystery of the Great Beyond! Is it a *splendid* mystery?

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

I Shot at God

I shot at God!
The hard-won science of long centuries
Devised, and toil that crushed the souls of men
Fashioned in flaming furnaces and forged
Amid the din of great steam-hammer blows
Supreme achievement of the art of war.
And I was skilled to train the sights aright,
Pointing the deadly tube unerringly.

God watched me all the time; and I could see
Upon His face an enigmatic smile.

I fired. I saw the missile burst. And then
No trace of God remained. The great white throne
Whereon he sat was shattered yet it stood.
Swiftly I sped and, ere the shining hosts
Of saints and angels rallied from the shock,
I sat amid the broken emblems of
His majesty. There—then—I laughed, great gusts
Of merriment that filled all Heaven and
Resounded from the far confines of space.
God had been so absurd. His power at last
So small! Colossal impudence! Consummate bluff!

Somewhat it troubled me that God had smiled.

Obsequious though sullen angels now
Obeyed my will and moved at my command.
The sulky choirs of Heaven strove to learn
Earth's latest jazz and sing the praise of Man.
So was I Greater God and thought to bring
Reason to rule and joy to liberty.

But suddenly through all my grandeur blew
A chilling wind, at first scarce noticed but
With every movement waxing stronger and
More fiercely cold. The light of heaven passed
By scarce perceptible degrees from noon's
Bright splendor to a twilight sinister
And dread. The bright angelic forms were changed
To shadows—pale, wan ghosts that lacked the strength
Even to mock at me. Then all was gone:
And I was falling through the limitless
Abyss of dark and empty space. The wind
Roared in my ears and fearful cold benumbed
My very heart. Then all became one voice
(Perhaps the shriek of my own agony)
Crying, "O Fool, Fool, Fool that hast slain God!
Whose life was all the universe. With Him
Died life itself and perished light and hope."

At first I knew only that I was still,
No longer falling through the horror of
Black emptiness. Then that I lived. All space
Grew slowly filled with light. I dared
To look about me. Lo, God sat again
On high! And I was lying prostrate at
His feet. I marked that all His being shone
With more resplendent glory than before.
He smiled. I could not read the meaning there.

I sprang erect. My hand was quick and true
In that salute one warrior renders to
A greater, and with head flung back I cried,
"You win! What now? I offer no excuse
And crave no mercy. Wreak Thy vengeance on
Myself, as I had thought to vanquish Thee."

I heard God's mighty voice make answer strange:
"My little fool! My power spreadeth Space
Abroad, and Time is but My pulsing life.
My fingers fashioned all the worlds and hid
The iron in the depths of earth. The high
Explosive's power was but my own, concealed
In grains of brownish dust. Your skill, your life,
Your strange intent—all these were mine. Judge you,
Was there not ample reason I should smile?
Ask now forgiveness for your sinful pride.
My grace is rich and free, and strong to heal
The wounds of folly and of wilful sin."

"Not so!" I cried, and stood my ground, my head
Still lifted high. "Let whining cowards beg
Release from sin's stern penalties. Not all
Thy power can re-write the past, nor change
The damning fact. Nor can all heaven's bliss
Assuage the burning pains of memory.
Yet hast Thou granted, all unasked, mercy
I thought not on. For though the heat of Thy
Fierce wrath flow o'er me in great floods of flame,
Though I lie bound in gyves of adamant,
Lo, I have seen Thy majesty and know
At last that all men's fairest hopes are true."

Strange tenderness was vibrant in God's voice.
"Think, little one, of Golgotha's grim cross.
All motions, changes, meanings, values rise
From clash of opposites. The wrath of man
Is made to praise My love; and direst sins
Release great overwhelming floods of grace."

I knew then why God's glory gleamed more bright.
I noted that the shattered throne had been
Rebuilt in fairer form. A sudden joy
Possessed me wholly and I cried, "O God,
I yield me to Thine overwhelming grace."

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS

Whither North America

Every student of the history of English philanthropy is familiar with the early and pre-Tudor legislation affecting the interests of the poor and knows that it was all intended to bolster up the decaying social order of feudalism. The statute of laborers, enacted in 1349, expressly prohibited the migration of laborers and the asking of higher wages. The black death had decimated fifty per cent of the working population and the temptation to wander off to those manor lords who might be willing to offer a higher wage payment was great. The law also forbade the giving of alms to "sturdy beggars," the able-bodied unemployed, for it was clearly recognized that if the mobility of labor was encouraged or even tolerated, serfdom was doomed and the lords upon whom the king depended for his revenues, would be ruined.

To such a student it is equally patent that the majority of the "New Deal" legislation is designed to preserve the order of the Nineteenth Century despite its shortcomings so forcefully presented by the current depression. John T. Flynn's brilliant magazine article of last fall, "Whose Baby Is the NRA?" harnessed that particular bit of astute ledgerdemain to the United States Chamber of Commerce so effectively that the Supreme Court has now been forced to save the administration's face. Unemployment relief is admittedly only a palliative. The whole "Recovery Program" is based upon the premise that recovery is possible and that the system, at heart, is sound.

Social workers all over the country are concerned about the problem they are finding in the matter of young married couples in their early twenties applying for relief and never having had any employment at all. Upon leaving high school they "stayed at home" and eventually married. Many are coming from families already receiving public assistance so that the shift in family composition merely involves a change in the make-up of the case records concerned. So clear are the implications of this problem that Will Durant, in addressing the D. A. R. recently, declared that perhaps we were headed towards a revival of the dowry system. This, of course, is absurd for such a custom never reached any more than the very small percentage of the population that was not entirely dependent upon earned income.

Then, in addition to this difficulty facing the youth of the day, the man over forty-five is definitely not wanted by the employers. His working days are over, perhaps forever!

All of which is preliminary to the question to be asked the reader. How many of you remember the subject that was on everybody's mind in the autumn of 1932? It was given wide publicity but it was laughed out of court and the public as usual, quickly forgot about the matter. The scientists behind the movement, however, kept to the part of the work still undone and have been quietly going ahead, establishing the validity of their case and waiting for the time to present it again for further consideration. The subject is "Technocracy."

The publicity the Technocrats were given three years ago was in one sense, wisely timed, because they are now able to show to how great an extent their prognosis was correct. They suffered however, from the great body of dilettants who made possible the flooding of the reading market with countless books and magazine articles by writers who did not understand the material themselves. As a consequence, the great bulk of available reading matter on the subject is of no value whatever. Today there are only three publications that are specifically authorized by the corporation.

There is no point particularly in giving here the writer's interpretation of the technocrat philosophy. Much of it he realizes passes his understanding. His function rather is to throw out for consideration by the reader, some of the more startling of the theories this group has formulated. The wise reader, of course, will go to the source materials himself.

Now, if for instance, modern machinery can produce, as the technocrats say, sufficient commodities to establish an adequate standard of living for the entire population of the North American continent with an amount of human effort equivalent only to what can be crowded into four hours per day for one hundred and sixty-five days per year and exerted only by those individuals who are between the ages of twenty-five and forty-five, then unemployment, in the sense we think of it today, is to be permanent. Even granting that the standard set up by the technocrats is not sufficient to satisfy the ever increasing desires of human beings, the margin of time allowed will permit an enormous expansion in that standard and still make for unemployment.

Technocracy, of course goes far beyond the challenge of a continuing unemployment. It calmly and dispassionately states that the price system is doomed because of its inherent defects. It has no slogan to catch the popular imagination. It feels no concern over the person who cannot, or perversely, *will not* think the thing through. It is quietly reasoned, and in a word, its criticism of the system is scientific and objective.

Obviously, the major interest of industry is profit on the investment. With the improvement of machine methods and the consequent lessened need for human labor, costs go down and profits increase. What we all are so painfully learning now is that, if enough men are thrown out of work because of this technical advancement, there comes a time when only those who have somehow managed to keep their jobs can buy the products manufactured. Those who lost their jobs must go without and the demand for the commodity decreases. The result is over-production or more correctly, under-consumption. Then it follows that prices fall, profits vanish, and the rate of interest on the capital invested approaches zero. This is the vicious circle produced by the price system.

The technocrats offer many specific examples of the absurdity of this arrangement. One of the most striking perhaps, is that of a great American railway which according to its annual report for 1931, has a bonded indebtedness of over $310,000,000. In 1997, $106,000,000 becomes due and in

2047, another $199,000,000. That is, in 2047, this railroad will be obligated to pay a vast sum of money for equipment that will probably have been non-existent for fifty or more years. We wonder that we never thought of this before.

The technocrats suggest that the figures of production and employment be plotted on a graph and they go to show that whereas the curve of production progresses ever upward until 1929, the employment curve moves steadily downward. In 1900, it required 70 man-hours to produce a ton of steel but by 1929, one man working 13 hours could produce the same amount. In 1901, one man was able to turn out 1,000 letterheads per hour, but by 1929, his capacity was increased to 20,000 per hour. And this has gone on even during the depression. Today, for instance, a man can manufacture 2,500 cigarettes per minute whereas, a year ago, five or six hundred was the maximum.

The 310 million dollars indebtedness of one corporation has been cited. The total indebtedness of all industries in the country—the total industrial debt—has been estimated to be 218 *billion*! Half of the total income of the nation goes to pay interest alone each year! That is, every year, half of our total income is turned in to pay interest charges on the bonds, mortgages, and bank loans that go to make up this 218 billion dollars of debt.

In 1930, the three principal stockholders of the Ford Motor Company profited to the extent of $44,000,000. Obviously, this sum could not be spent entirely on personal requirements but under the present system, must of necessity be reinvested. But this demands further interest and dividends! How can the industrial debt of 218 billion dollars ever be paid? The technocrats say that it will never, indeed *can* never, be paid, and with the ranks of the unemployed continually swelling, the man in the street begins to wonder if they are not right.

At one point of course, it is said that the working of the system has "forced the manufacturer to reduce the total number employed rather than to distribute the amount of time required among the total number of available workers." The expense of permitting the machines to stop moving twice a day and the time lost in waiting for the fresh worker to "get into his stride" are vital factors, it is true, but there is no proof that future invention will not take care of this. Here indeed, technocracy appears to issue a challenge to the engineers themselves.

In Howard Scott's own book, the author wisely writes: "Technocracy proposes no solution—" but in a pamphlet, "Some Questions Answered," also an official publication unfortunately, many rash statements are made that may sound fantastic enough to destroy in the reader's mind, the convincing quality of the criticisms of the price system. Those who have read the two bound volumes will approach the other warily, but many will swallow it whole and fail to digest it.

They confess that when the economic order finally crashes, one cool head in the pulpit, in the schoolroom, etc., will be of inestimable value. They recognize the value of anyone engaged in a "socially useful occupation," but the phamplet describes a society in which, when the "American Technate" is finally established, practically all problems will have disappeared into thin air. This is too optimistic a picture. Granting for instance, that, as they say, human behavior is conditioned by its environment, it does not necessarily follow that "deliberate refusal to fulfill one's part of the energy contract would be so rare as to be of no social significance." Technocracy will not inevitably inspire the lazy man with unbounded ambition or make incompatible wives and husbands coo like turtle doves.

Perhaps the energy certificates will prove more satisfactory than the established currency, but the medium of exchange the technocrats offer as a substitute, may have weaknesses of its own. The system may collapse suddenly, but perhaps the powers that be, in an effort to save a remnant of their heritage, may permit changes from time to time so gradual that the "American Technate" may be with us before we recognize it. Certainly the changes of the last ten years have been revolutionary in scope despite the reactionary quality of their nature.

Whatever may be their mistakes upon minor points, the technocrats visualize accurately the certain doom of the existing order be it American or Russian or Chinese. They see clearly the futility of artificial stimulants like the farm debt moratorium and the abrogation of the gold clause in private bonds. They recognize the inexorable nature of the changes that are upon us and the fact that the present order is done for just as surely as feudalism was by the Fourteenth Century. Whether or not the way out that they offer is the one and only one that can be safely taken is beside the point. Certainly their theories demand a more searching analysis than the thinking men and women of America have given them in the past. People who wish to call themselves well informed will find out more about Technocracy. FRANK DOANE.

The Study Table

Clubfoot

Across all the wasted years separating us from the somber epoch of Reconstruction, one figure looms mightily, overshadowing the rest—that of Clubfoot, alias Thaddeus Stevens,* dictator and dogmatist, hero of Callender, Schurtz, Clemenceau, and Woodburn; villain of Dixon, Griffith, Bowers, James Fort Milton, and Lloyd Paul Stryker. This dantonesque democrat, anti-mason, defender of education, Free-Soiler and Nemesis of the South, who, in his hour of supremacy, divided that stricken dominion into conquered provinces ruled by belted satraps, giving the whole over to a weird Witches' Sabbath, dying too soon to witness destruction of his dictatorship by the Ku-Klux-Klan, has long awaited his biography. It has come at last, however, from the competent pen of Mr. T. Frederick Woodley: and it is one of those books that start a man groping blindly up the dusty corridors of his intellectual past, in an endeavor to recapture that fierce sanguinary spirit of civil war and aftermath when the

*Thaddeus Stevens. By T. Frederick Woodley. Published by the Telegraph Press, Harrisburg, Pa., 1934. $4.00.

Union was rent asunder and when, in the blind chaos following our first great Presidential assassination, Stevens rose to ride the whirlwind and direct the greatest storm that ever swept America; to enforce France's revolutionary ideals at the bayonet's point; and, finally, to stage the first jeremiad to destroy a President and set up a democratic despotism. Carlyle alone, had he cared, might have done the period pictorial justice: and, since Mr. Woodley expressly deprecates any attempt to portray this background, it remains for us to follow him as best we may, nor set the ominous personality of Clubfoot against the crimson sunset of his times, but detail that career as thus displayed: the most momentous spectacle, perhaps, that ever engrossed the pen of any historical playright. "To the drama, then," with Thomas Hardy's *Dynasts,* "and follow it!"

Preluded by a tremendous apologue of impeachment (at once introducing our grim protagonist at apotheosis and setting his stage), Mr. Woodley's production surges swiftly yet penetratingly upon its way, showing us the crippled infancy of Clubfoot; his early barristership at Gettysburg; his delicate Robespierre-like beginnings in the legislature; his Marat-like anti-masonic crusade, shadowed by mystic ritual and fantastic furies; his iron-fisted championship of anti-slavery, and the Buckshot War; a Homeric combat for education throughout Pennsylvania; successive onslaughts upon slavery in Congress as the abyss of civil catastrophe slowly widened; Clubfoot's dantonesque audacity pressing the war to a triumphant conclusion—and the downfall of Abraham Lincoln before assassination, which gave Stevens full sway over the hectic ordeal of reconstruction, inspiring his attempt to dethrone an Executive and enthrone a Legislature as well as metamorphose ten great states into conquered satrapies ruled by major generals and former slaves, from which diablerie of chaos there arose to the astounded midnight moon a spectral shape of the authentic ghostly hue, galloping upon a thousand noiseless hooves and brandishing on high a mysterious flaming cross. But all this latter undoing of his dogmatism followed only the death of the dictator—and, having sketched the first outlines of this tremendous spectacle, we must return in order to consider its details, more especially the personality of its protagonist.

Crippled from birth, a failure at fifty financially, and again at seventy, mentally muscle-bound by a biting inferiority complex due to this incubus, Clubfoot, his emotional sinews toughened by slanderous attacks and by his own oratorical successes, girds his loins for the mighty contest of war and reconstruction—in speeches worthy Danton or Mirabeau, he denounces the slave-holding aristocrats who on the floor of Congress defy abolition and threaten the Union; valiantly he hurls back into their teeth the menace of force; and, as the hour of dissolution strikes, Stevens unhesitatingly seizes the helm of opinion, and, in support of Lincoln, swings the mass mind of the North to support the assaulted federal government supervising moreover the internicine war attendant, crowned by the victory at Appomattox. Then, the cataclysm at an end, this Clubfoot, colossus of contradictions, setting that fearful deformity upon the President, proceeds to stamp upon the new-born nation, fresh and glowing molten from war's fiery furnace, his own egalitarian impress—an attempt at realizing the brotherhood of man foredoomed to failure, one is bound to believe, not only because of a doubtful dye, but because the metal resisted fiercely this fervid fusion, finally defeating it entirely. . . . A stupendous argument, in fact, has this epic of Thaddeus Stevens: and the execution rises faithfully to meet it—indeed, there is an epic grandeur about Mr. Woodley's prose not unworthy such a master as Carlyle.

A colossal protagonist, a mighty theme, a sufficient stage—all three are woven together by the skilled pen of Mr. Woodley into a biographical drama which, with its action, color, humor, vivacity, carries the spectator along with it as it traverses the most colorful epoch in our nation's history. From Clubfoot's early jehads, through the long tide of civil strife and impeachment, to the titanic death of Stevens, it surges Carlylean on its way, displaying, besides its Chief, a galaxy of striking personalities: Lincoln the deep-eyed; Tombs the incandescent; Ritner, the portly anti-masonic paladin; Stephens; Chase; Sumner; Grant; Tilton; Philips; Butler, and others. Dominates the whole Clubfoot, the Great Commoner, compound of contradictions; "rarely an orator, words his weapons," "politician scorning the populace," with "his total indifference to office and fame" and his nationwide dictatorship, "his mastery of language . . . and parsimony of words," his hate and his charity, his sweeping blows, his "withering scorn," his "ironic wit." An arresting, challenging figure, beyond a doubt—and the considerable enthusiasm aroused in one by his audacious democracy, his uncompromising egalitarianism, constrains the belief, without judging either, that had he lived longer by but a span, his brotherhood of man had arrived to provide an example to the ages, as, in spite of all unavailing efforts afterwards at resucitation, perhaps it may.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

"Jesus Was Not Jew"

When the title of this volume* first greeted our vision, we must confess that we were reminded of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise's witty rejoinder to some scholar, who may be nameless, about twenty years ago, who, it seems, had advanced the theory that Jesus was not a Jew. The good Rabbi was preaching a series of sermons on "The Life and Teachings and Death of Jesus, the Jew." After recounting how chiefly on the verse in Matthew or Luke (I haven't time to look it up), that tells of Joseph taking Mary and the babe, Jesus, down to Egypt, this self-styled scholar had concluded Jesus was of Egyptian parentage, Rabbi Wise replied in substance:

I would not be surprised to read in tomorrow's newspaper that this same so-called scholar had conclusively proven to his own satisfaction that John was a Norwegian, Peter an Irishman and Paul a North American Indian.

Our first misgivings about a volume with such a title were soon to give way to enthusiasm, as we read the opening pages. "Here," we said to ourselves, "is a legally trained mind, who has something to offer by way of keen logical interpretation or archeological find that will be good." It seemed he was interested supremely in ascertaining facts, as distinct from beliefs that had been imbedded in minds from their youth up. His method of selecting ten or more typical friends, each one of whom was certain that somewhere in the New Testament the statement was made that Jesus was a

*Jesus Was Not Jew, by William Harry Montgomery, LL.B., and obtainable only through the publishers, the Research Co., P. O. Box 575, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y. for $2.50.

Jew, only to discover that such a statement cannot be found within the Canon, looked promising. His obvious sincerity and legal slant to the mind seemed to offset his own lament that his was not a name to conjure with among the men of letters and philosophy of our day. It is true that his digressions often seemed futile, but we laid that to an exacting and legally trained intellect.

Then too we relished his clever and splendid condemnation of the dogmatists, and those who could not discern the legendary character of such a narrative as the Three Wise Men. Here, thought we, is a real scholar, whose work cannot be overlooked, but must loom in importance, and may be difficult to answer.

Alas! We were doomed wholly to disappointment. This man who could almost rave at dogmatists and those who swallow New Testament myths and legends, himself turned out to be the Jonah that swallowed the greatest whale of a legend that ever attached itself to one of earth's greatest sons. Of course, Jesus was not a Jew. He was not a human. He was a member of God's inner family circle. He was born of Mary, the Virgin. Even Mary, according to this author, was "not of the earth, earthy," but outmatched even the dogma and legend of the Roman Catholic Church that confers an Immaculate Conception on Mary alone of the daughters of men, by having her like the legendary Enoch or Elijah carried up to Heaven without tasting of death. How true the first clause we quote from page 84, "But fancy leads us astray; there is no such shrine of the Virgin's burial place because the Virgin was not of the earth, and to the earth she did not return." How silly the rest of this statement!

Well, unfortunately, this author realizes all too patently the weaknesses he confides to us at the outset that he has. We cannot think of how anyone could be better unprepared for the task he has essayed than is this representative of the bar. It is simply pathetic to see him swallowing the dogma of the objectivity of angels, such as Gabriel; the traditional authorship of various New Testament books (can you imagine, New Testament scholars, "Simon Peter . . . author of I Peter and II Peter," P. 86!) Is there anything that the incredulity of this man will not swallow? And after we had supposed he'd be rid of dogma and legends! P. 88 we read, "And so to none of them was accorded the privilege of ascending physically into Heaven as did Christ, and as did his mother Mary, if the Catholic doctrine is to be believed and there is no reason not to believe it." Out of the frying pan of one set of dogmas this chap does not like into the fire of dogmas that have been the devastation of the human mind for centuries!

The genealogies of Matthew and Luke he knows to be spurious; but is so happy that "cousin" need not mean any blood relationship between the Jewess, Elizabeth, and the Virgin Mary. The climax of absurdity is reached when he writes on page 95, "For to no thinking mind can there be any doubt or any cavil over the doctrine of the Virgin Birth." We have always understood that "no thinking mind" ever thought the Virgin Birth of Jesus a fact. We supposed that at this late date all scholars know how it arose after Paul and after Mark's Gospel, when the Greek speaking Gentile Christians read in the Septuagint translation of Isaiah 7:14, "A Virgin shall conceive and bear a son"; while the Hebrew reads, the context clearly referring to some birth within two years or so of Isaiah's conversation with Ahaz, "A pure young woman (alma —either married or unmarried) shall conceive, etc." He accepts "Gabriel's visitations as a fast," and adds naively, "and this latter manifestation no one even questions." Well, here's one, brother, and we can show you multitudes! How can a man close Chap. 12 with "traditions notoriously are impostors," and open Chap. 13 with

> By no possible process of the reasoning can we escape the conclusion that Jesus Christ was wholly divine. And, naturally, to reach such a decision we necessarily must discard all theories of his having been in any degree a human, which automatically eliminates him, not only from the Hebrew, but from all races?

Yet the Church combatted the Gnostics of the early centuries at this point, and has always with the author of Hebrews insisted on Christ's humanity as well as his divineness! Certainly meaning what our author means by divinity, we think Jesus would be the first to refute such magical divineness of himself. Even Paul is summoned to uphold our author's "gnosticism!"

What then is the value of a volume like this? Our author's reference to the thankgiving of the Mormons for crops during that first fearful winter in Utah reminds us how years ago we read in an official Mormon volume to this effect. Abraham, Jacob, David, Solomon, etc. were men of God, were they not? They were polygamists were they not? Therefore, polygamy is the divine way of life, and should universally supersede the vile human degeneration of monogamy! Such in substance was the argument, for which the Church as a whole is to blame. Too long has it loved dogma rather than the truth, which alone can set us all free. It upheld, and still does in many places, the ignorant dogma of an inerrant Bible. Therefore, the logic of the Mormons on polygamy! In similar manner our author, no doubt an earnest, sincere, vigorous, but deluded victim of Christian dogma, is simply carrying out the logic of the dogma of the Virgin Birth, angels, miracles etc., with which the Christian Church is often too cowardly to wrestle, and to tell the truth about their origin, purpose, the values they once sought to conserve for men, but long since have lost for all who are emancipated from all puerile dogmas, legends and myths.

This book should wake the church to the urgent need to free its people from ancient and medieval legends, even though "sanctified" by inclusion in the Canon of the New Testament. If it does that, it will have achieved a great purpose, though opposite to what the author may wish.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Aspiration

This day has been voluminous with life;
It has turned death to friend and far to near.
By gently misting years that sadly hung,
It has wrought glory from the now and here;
And pennants, that the world has ever flung
To him who has affirmed the gallant part,
Have had their challenge answered—high resolve
Has spun new wisdom for a truant heart!

CLAIRE STEWART BOYER.

The Field

(*Continued from Page 234*)

a glorious truth shines clear. For the first time in human history, man has the technical knowledge to solve his economic problem. He can at last provide sufficient material goods for an abundant life. Since the depression the researches of scientists and engineers, the findings of private and governmental commissions, have been reiterating this same basic fact. The natural resources of the United States of America and the industrial and agricultural equipment are sufficient to give every man, woman and child the material basis for the good life. Recent governmental estimates and other authoritative studies have indicated that had our plants been used to capacity in 1929 over $4,000 in goods and services could have been supplied to every American family. Nevertheless, 16,000,000 American families, or nearly two-thirds of our people, actually received in that year less than $2,000. That was six years ago. Since then inventions and improvements in technological processes have marched steadily on. The clear truth is that from a purely physical, engineering point of view we could now produce enough fully and completely to banish poverty. Yet, in spite of this potential plenty, restricted production in both industry and agriculture is the rule, while devastating poverty and unemployment continue. We have the natural resources; we have the machinery; we can produce enough for all. This good news must be proclaimed to every worker with hand or brain.

Effective means must be found to eradicate sins of selfishness and to make this abundance available for all. The solution of the deplorable maladjustment in distribution is adequate income for the masses and security of employment. Only by a more equalized ability to purchase can the anomaly of want in the midst of abundance be solved. To achieve such an end new forms of social control must be designed. New ways must be found.

But these new ways cannot be found unless men are free to discuss frankly and openly the problems before them. We rejoice in the great American principle of free speech and press which is enthroned in our federal and state constitutions. This principle has its roots in the Christian faith. We would solemnly point out that the changes which must come in our economic set-up can come peaceably only if the channels of communication are kept open. True Americans and true Christians must be ever alert to repel any attempt to deprive them of these civil rights so important in a democracy. Moreover, they must champion these rights for the weakest among us, for if one group be suppressed it will only be a question of time until such suppression is extended to all who dare voice opposition to those temporarily in power.

Again it is important on this Labor Sunday, as we extend our greetings to the toilers of the nation, to point out the basic importance of organization. Employers have found it decidedly to their benefit to band themselves together for mutual aid and counsel. It is equally important that the men who labor should band themselves together that they, too, may bargain collectively through their own freely chosen representatives. We rejoice that the churches have gone on record in their Social Ideals for "the right of employees and employers alike, to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of this right; the obligation of both to work for the public good; encouragement of cooperatives and other organizations among farmers and other groups." Such organization of those who labor with hand or brain is essential if justice for all is to be achieved. It is good to recall that the American labor leader, Samuel Gompers, declared: "I have been jealous that the American labor movement should never lose its character of a great crusade for human justice."

Finally, the churches must ceaselessly proclaim that out of the heart are the issues of life. True religion must stand always not only against exploitation but against the very desire to exploit. The Christian religion demands now and must always demand that both human hearts and human institutions be controlled and judged by that mind which was in Christ Jesus.

An Attack on Freedom

One would suppose that the suppression of free press and free speech in the dictator-governed countries of Europe would be a lesson to every American. But apparently not. There is pending in the House of Representatives a bill (H. R. 5845) which would limit free speech and free press in this country to a far greater extent than the Espionage Act during the World War. This act is similar to one recently passed by the Senate, backed, as might be suspected, by the Military Affairs Committee. The House bill follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, including the reserves thereof, to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces, or whoever publishes or distributes any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing which advises, counsels, urges or solicits any member of such military or naval forces of the United States to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years or both.

"Sec. 2. Any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing of the character described in section 1 of this Act may be taken from any house or other place in which it may be found, or from any person in whose possession it may be, under a search warrant issued pursuant to the provisions of title XI of the Act entitled 'An Act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917."

In commenting on this bill Marlen E. Pew writes in *Editor & Publisher*: "The act would set up a censorship of the press, especially mean because in effect ex post facto. Imagine a poor devil caught by it trying to plead innocence of motive in publishing or distributing some blast against war as an institution, if some hysterical flagwaver should show that the publication caused some vagrant half-bake to revolt! Witch-chasers would have a swell party under this law, and fair America would be dragged further toward the vicious philosophy of Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin. Why can't we enjoy our freedom? Why

must we grovel?" Such legislation is all of a piece with the various oath bills and alien sedition bills passed or pending in many states. It is tragic to see Americans going through these cases of jitters. But they are a warning to all true lovers of liberty.

Every clergyman, particularly, ought to understand the full implications of this bill. *It could easily be invoked to prosecute persons who have no intention of inciting soldiers or sailors to disobedience and in cases where no such result could be shown.* Under this bill, if enacted, freedom of speech would face a greater hazard than in all our peacetime history. Criticism of the administration, the military policy, the big navy spokesmen, etc., could be distorted into incitement to the military forces to disobedience. Agitation for pay increases in the army, or better conditions for soldiers and sailors might become criminal on the part of civilians. *It could be used to prosecute citizens who protest against the use of the National Guard in strikes, or for other police purposes.* The proposed bill is a direct threat to the interests of organized labor, and to all who oppose the usually unnecessary use of troops in strikes. Organized labor is always opposed to the use of troops because experience has taught them that they curtail labor's rights to strike and picket. Under the proposed law, any opposition to the troops or to the martial law that often accompanies them, would be a federal crime. The law would put an added and powerful weapon or prosecution into the hands of employers against labor. Any appeal to the National Guard not to fire on strikers—as has often been done—would be a prima facie violation of the law. *It could create governmental control by prosecution of publishers or distributors of anti-war books and periodicals.* The present bill would create in effect an ex post facto censorship of the press. The innocence of motive or intent in the publishing or distributing of anti-war material would not be a factor of the crime, and the jury, regardless of any present danger to society, could find a defendant guilty if the utterance might result in disaffection. *It is entirely unnecessary, as existing laws adequately punish disaffection, mutiny, or disobedience in the army and navy, or any conspiracy among civilians to incite disaffection.*

The only offense not reached by existing law is the publication or utterance by a single civilian—not party to a conspiracy of two or more persons—of language construed to incite disobedience. Such an offense should not be punished, for mere utterances by single individuals constitute no danger and are too easily misconstrued to be subject to prosecution. The time to object is now, before the chains are fastened on all peace advocates. Letters of protest should go at once to Senators and especially to members of the House strongly protesting against the bill and asking them what can be done to prevent its becoming law. Nothing could be more urgent in the cause of free speech and of peace.

—*The Churchman.*

Books & Pamphlets Received

Harper & Brothers, New York.

Reprinted by permission. Published for special circulation by the Inter-Religious Committee for Justice for Thomas J. Mooney, Box 894, Hollywood Sta., Los Angeles, Cal.

Our American Dreyfus Case—A Challenge to California Justice. By Lillian Symes.

Beacon Press, The, Inc., Boston.

The Beacon Units in Religious Education:

Unit No. 1. The Life and Religion of the Early Hebrews. By Emily F. Ellis.

Unit No. 2. Making a Better Neighborhood. By Thelma J. Burdick and Josephine Gifford.

Unit No. 3. A Dramatic Service of Worship—How It Grew. By Catherine M. Conradi.

By mail 68 cents each.

Harper & Brothers, New York.

What Religion Is and Does. By Horace T. Houf. Price $3.00.

Indian Social Reformer, The, Ltd., Bombay.

Our Trip to America. By Natarajan. Price $2.00.

Macmillan Company, The, New York.

The Ancient World. By T. R. Glover. Price $2.50.

THE MODERN THINKER
Edited by DAGOBERT D. RUNES, Ph. D.

A Truly International Magazine

For the intelligent reader keenly interested in the affairs of the world, affairs that embrace politics, literature, philosophy, sociology, art, science.

The Modern Thinker has an unbiased and cosmopolitan viewpoint. It has one interest: to present the finest writing by the finest minds. You can find, side by side in *the Modern Thinker*, an iconoclastic essay on the ruthlessness of nature by Llewellyn Powys; George Bernard Shaw on the problem of sterilization; Arnold Zweig on half-Jews and their worries in the modern world. In current issues you will find such articles as "DICTATORS ARE JUVENILES," by George Conrad Ebbert, "IN DEFENSE OF PESSIMISM," by Paul Eldridge, "3,000 MEN DISAPPEAR," by Eugene Bertram Willard.

You will find the MODERN THINKER comprehensive and intensely interesting. There is a special subscription rate at present—$2.00 for one year. Simply enclose this sum (Bills, check, or money order) and mail to THE MODERN THINKER, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.

In the Summer Issue of

The New Humanist

A HUMANIST VIEW OF JUDAISM DISCUSSED
By Eugene Kohn and Felix Levy

REGIMENTATION AND LIBERTY
Robert Weston

T. S. ELIOT AND THE DEMON OF THE ABSOLUTE
Wallace Cable Brown

LIFE AND THE PHILOSOPHERS
Horace S. Fries

THE GOLDEN ROAD OF EDUCATION
F. J. Gould

ARE WE SPIRITUALLY BANKRUPT?
Max Kaufman

A SKEPTIC SALVAGES CONSCIENCE
Edwin H. Wilson

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books postpaid: HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 *Per Copy* 25c
Canadian & Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, Inc.

330 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois